

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-10 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. New claims 11-19 have been added.

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action states that each of dependent claims 3, 4 and 7 are dependent from canceled claim 1, and assumes that dependency should be from claim 2. In addition, claim 5 appears to have been rejected for reasons of clarity. Appropriate amendments have been made to each of these claims herein, and it is respectfully submitted that these § 112 rejections have been obviated thereby.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,885,158 to Torango, et al. ("Torango") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,964,638 to Ishida ("Ishida"). In addition, claims 3 and 5 also stand rejected under the foregoing, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,183,362 to Boushy ("Boushy"). In light of the amendments to independent claims 2 and 8 made herein, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In order to render a claim as obvious, a purported combination of references must contain every material element of that claim. *See* MPEP § 2143. Claims 2 and 8 as amended each recite the element "wherein communications between said gaming [machines/devices] and each of said first and second [and gaming machine] networks all take place over at least one single optic fiber

selected from said [] communication links." Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to disclose such an element of communications from multiple networks over a single optic fiber, as is presently claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending § 103 rejections for at least this reason.

### III. New Claims

Claims 11-19 are new. Support for each of these new claims can be found throughout the specification and in the original claims as filed, and particularly at paragraphs 22 and 24. New claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 8, and as such are patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons given for claim 8. New independent claim 15, and new claims 16-21 that depend therefrom, are also patentable over the prior art, for the same reasons given above.

Applicant also points out that, much like the amendments to claims 2 and 8 above, the various elements presented by these new claims also do not appear to be present within the prior art, at least with respect to the manner being claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over the prior art for at least these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and requests a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fees are due at this time. Should an extension of time fee or any other fee be required for any reason related to this document, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P117C1. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Date: February 4, 2005



Justin A. White, Esq.  
Reg. No. 48,883

Beyer, Weaver & Thomas LLP  
P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300

IGT1P117C1

-12-